

Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	09/673,106	GRIEU ET AL.
	Examiner Aravind K. Moorthy	Art Unit 2131

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Aravind K. Moorthy. (3) Chris Revak.

(2) Stanley Spooner. (4) _____.

Date of Interview: 17 April 2007.

Type: a) Telephonic b) Video Conference
c) Personal [copy given to: 1) applicant 2) applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) Yes e) No.

If Yes, brief description: _____.

Claim(s) discussed: 1.

Identification of prior art discussed: Cheung U.S. Patent No. 6,062,472.


Agreement with respect to the claims f) was reached. g) was not reached. h) N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: See Continuation Sheet.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.


Aravind K. Moorthy
Examiner's signature, if required

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: The attorney discussed the invention with respect to the claim language. Based on the discussion, the examiner conducted an updated search. The examiner discovered the Cheung reference during the updated search. A subsequent interview was conducted based upon the Cheung reference. The attorney discussed the difference between the current application and the Cheung reference. The attorney stated that the process in the Cheung reference takes place a the security module and not on the card (i.e. provisionally recording and the finalization of the modifications). The examiner agreed to allow the current application based on the interview. The attorney agreed to amend the specification to include headings. The attorney agreed to amend claim 16 by removing the word "are" in the last limitation to correct grammar issues .